

1
2
3
4
5
6 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
7
8 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
9

10 FREDERICK JACKSON *et al.*,

No. C 09-01016 WHA

11 Plaintiffs,

12 v.

13 CITY OF PITTSBURG, *et al.*,


**ORDER REGARDING PLAINTIFF'S
COUNSEL'S RESPONSE TO ORDER
REGARDING STATE COURT FILING**

14 Defendants.
15 _____/

16 The Court has reviewed Attorney Lagos's response to the order dated January 7, 2011
17 (Dkt. No. 293). Although language of the type quoted appeared in the decisions referenced, the
18 actual rate of the applying attorney was made known to the district judge in most cases, and in
19 no case was it concealed as far as the Court can tell. This Court is of the firm view that Mr.
20 Lagos should have revealed his actual billing rate and then explained why he felt he was
21 entitled to a higher rate. Exactly how this will factor into the award of attorney's fees will be
22 left for a future day, and whether this matter will be referred to the State Bar of California will
23 be left for a future day. In the meantime, counsel shall proceed with their meet-and-confer
24 sessions as outlined in the order regarding attorney's fees dispute (Dkt. No. 292). The
25 submissions required therein shall now be due on **FEBRUARY 3, 2011, AT NOON**. Please do not
26 ask for extensions.

27 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

28 Dated: January 20, 2011.



WILLIAM ALSUP
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE